Correlated Cascades: Compete or Cooperate

Ali Zarezade
Sharif Univ. of Tech.
Azadi Ave
Tehran, Iran
zarezade@ce.sharif.edu

Ali Khodadadi
Sharif Univ. of Tech.
Azadi Ave
Tehran, Iran
khodadadi@ce.sharif.edu

Mehrdad Farajtabar
Georgia Institute of Tech.
North Ave NW, Atlanta,
GA 30332, United States
mehrdad@gatech.edu

Hamid R. Rabiee
Sharif Univ. of Tech.
Azadi Ave
Tehran, Iran
rabiee@sharif.edu

Le Song
Georgia Institute of Tech.
North Ave NW, Atlanta,
GA 30332, United States
lsong@cc.gatech.edu

Hongyuan Zha
Georgia Institute of Tech.
North Ave NW, Atlanta,
GA 30332, United States
zha@cc.gatech.edu

arXiv:1510.00936v2 [cs.SI] 18 Nov 2015

ABSTRACT

In real world social networks, there are multiple diffusion processes which are rarely independent. They usually interact with each other in a competitive or cooperative manner. In this paper, motivated by the reinforcement theory in sociology, we model the adoption behavior of users in social networks by a multivariate marked Hawkes process. According to this model, the intensity of a user to adopt any behavior is modeled by aggregation of behaviors of its neighbors. The type of adopted behavior is also defined probabilistically from the ratio of different product usages among neighbors in which a user can exhibit a competitive or cooperative behavior. In other words, users tend to conduct the mostly adopted behavior in a competitive environment. The resulting inference problem is proved to be convex and is solved by using the barrier method. The advantage of the proposed model is twofold; besides modeling dependent cascades, it also learns the underlying latent diffusion network. Experimental results on synthetic and two real datasets gathered from Twitter, URL shortening and music streaming services, illustrate the superior performance of the proposed model over alternatives.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

H.2.8 [**Database Management**]: Database Applications Data mining

Keywords

Correlated Cascades, Multivariate Marked Hawkes Process, Information Diffusion, Twitter.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.
WSDM San Francisco, California, USA
Copyright 2016 ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...$15.00.

1. INTRODUCTION

Social networks and virtual communities plays a key role in today's life. People engage in social interaction by commenting, liking, mentioning and following each other. They share their thoughts, beliefs, opinions, news, and even their check-ins in social networks. This virtual world is an ideal place for studying social behaviors and spread of cultural norms [1], contagion of disease [2], advertising and marketing [3], predicting the length of a cascade [4], detecting communities [5], clustering the contents and topics [6], studying the structural network properties [7] and even estimating the culprit in malicious diffusion [8]. Therefore, the study of information diffusion or more generally *dynamics on the network* is of crucial importance and can be used in a wide range of applications. The trace of information diffusion, virus or infection spread, rumor propagation, and product adoption is usually called *cascade* [8].

Most of the times, individual cascades, or behaviors considered in isolation; they assumed to be independent of each other. However in realistic situations, they are rarely independent. For example consider the streaming music or video service providers like, Spotify, SoundCloud, Google Play Music, and Youtube. In microblogging sites, users tweet their favorite songs, or currently playing track, which besides the URL's in the tweet, it may contains the related hashtags like, #nowplaying, #AlbumName, #ArtistName, and or #StreamingServiceName. One may stick with her favorite online music services, but when she is exposed the tweets of her followers, and see most of them use a specific music service provider, she may change her mind or at least be motivated to try it out. This is an example of a competitive behavior. In contrast, some cascades may be cooperating, and reinforcing each other. In the context of the above mentioned example, take into account, two streaming services like Google Play Music, and YouTube, one for music and the other for video. When a new album is released, many tweets containing its hyperlinks in different streaming services spread through the social network. Henceforth, a user may exposed to the tweets about this album with different links to streaming services. But some of this links encourage each other, you may be interested in both listening and viewing it. This is an example of cooperation.

The competing and cooperating behaviors can also be em-



Figure 1: Numbers of tweets per hour containing URL of (*left*) Google Play Music and YouTube streaming media services, and (*right*) different URL shortening services.

pirically observed in real datasets, gathered from Twitter microblogging site. Figure 1, shows the number of tweets per hour for a set of users, in several days. Tweets categorized according to the list of containing URLs, and each plotted separately. It can be seen that, the peaks and valleys of the blue and red curves, `google` and `youtube` tweets, are synchronized most of the time.This implies that they are cooperating each other. There is also a cooperating trend between `tiny.ly` and `tinyurl`, and competitive trend between `migre.me` and `j.mp`. These evidences validate our claim about correlation between cascades in real world examples. Most of the times, cascades are interrelated, they affect each other. In other words, friends and neighboring users may influence one's behavior. Modeling this phenomena is of crucial important in network science, which is addressed in this paper.

Modeling multiple cascades which are correlated to each other is challenging problem. Considerable work have done to extend basic diffusion models to competitive case [9, 10, 11]. Meyer *et al.* proposed a probabilistic model for diffusion of competitive or cooperative contagions [12]. They estimate the probability of a user being infected given a sequence of previously observed contagions. But the main drawback of these models is that they are all discrete time, which limit the flexibility of model. Valera in [3] proposed a continuous time for modeling adoption of competing products. But this approach is also incapable of learning the latent diffusion network, and our experimental results show that it prone to overfiting.

Motivated by the sociological evidences in social science about users behavior modeling, and the success of the recurrent point processes in modeling temporal event histories, we proposed a data-driven continuous method, which can model the spread of multiple correlated behaviors (informations, ideas, memes), and learn the underlying latent diffusion network, jointly. We modeled the *users' adoption behavior* by a stochastic point process. The intensity (instantaneous rate of expected number of events in a point process) of a user to adopt a behavior is considered as the weighted sum of intensities of its neighbors. In this way, we incorporate the fact that users are influenced by their friends in taking an action. The more your friends adopt a behavior the more your are excited to adopt it. This users' adoption behavior intensity is modeled by a special type of doubly stochastic process called Hawkes process [13]. The Hawkes family of point processes is well suited for the modeling of temporal events with self-exciting property [14, 15, 16, 17].

In the case of multiple correlated behaviors, as before, you may be tempted by the proliferation of your friend's tweets, but the adopted behavior depends on the correlation of cascades. In competitive case, the behavior that is recently adopted by the majority of your friend, will be adopted by the user with high probability. But in the cooperative case, all behaviors may be adopted approximately with the same probability. This adoption probability is also modeled by mark probability of the Hawks process. In non-competitive environments the mark probability is uniformly distributed between different behaviors, but in competitive case, the mostly adopted behavior in the community of your friends will be dominated.

The proposed method is intuitively illustrated in Figure 2. The procedure that a user adopts a product takes place in two steps. First, the user is motivated to adopt any behavior, then decides on the type of behavior. In Figure 2, the center node, according to the sum of the intensity of its neighbors, decides to adopt a behavior in a specific time. This is the first step. In the next step, there exist three general cases. In competitive environment, the behavior (green) that is recently adopted by a strong tie (node v) is more likely to be adopted. The probability of adoption of different behaviors is schematically depicted with outer pie chart in center node. On the other hand, in fully cooperative case all behaviors have the same probability to be adopted. This is also demonstrated by the inner pie chart. Finally in the case of independent cascades, depicted by the middle pie chart, the adoption probability of each behavior is proportional to the sum of the corresponding behavior intensities in all neighbors.

Finally, we validate the proposed method on synthetic and two real datasets. First, using synthetic data generated randomly we've studied how effectively we can recover the underlying network parameters. We have also highlighted the correlated behavior versus the independent and the competitive versus cooperative cascades using synthetic data. Next, we move forward to real data and show the correlated behavior In the real dataset. Furthermore, with parameters learned from training data, we generate event data and compare it to intensity of each product in real held-out test data and show that our framework can model the activities in social network better than the alternatives. Also for two exemplar product, one from each dataset, we plotted the intensity and total number of events, to compare methods qualitatively.



Figure 2: The behavior of an individual in social network is dependent on its neighbors intensity (the adoptions history), the relationship weights, and the correlation between behaviors. The probability of adopted behavior in cooperative, independent and competitive cases are illustrated by the inner, middle and outer pie charts. In cooperative case all behavior have nearly the same probability, whereas in competitive case the green behavior is dominating. In the independent case, the adoption probability of each behavior is linearly proportional to its corresponding intensity.

The contribution of this paper can be summarized as follows:.

- Modeling the behavior adoption of individuals using multivariate marked Hawkes process, and the spread of multiple correlated behaviors in social networks, consequently.
- Proposing a convex optimization formulation to learn the latent diffusion network and model parameters which is solved using barrier newton method.
- Curating a compelling dataset on streaming music services using Twitter API, from tweets of 30,000 active users in one moth during 2015 year.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 the prior works on modeling dynamical system over the networks will briefly reviewed. Proposed method is presented in section 3. Finally the experiments on synthetic and real dataset, and conclusion is brought forward in sections 3 and 4, respectively.

2. PRIOR WORKS

Social behaviors, the spread of cultural norms, or the emergence of consensus may often be modeled as the dynamical interaction of a set of connected agents [1]. Modeling dynamical process over the network has attracted significant attention in recent years. According to the network structure and time continuity, these models can be categorized in three general groups. Continuous time without network structure, discrete time with network structure and continuous time with network structure, that will be reviewed briefly in the following.

Continuous and unstructured. Early models making many simplistic assumptions. By abstracting out the network structure and considering micro-level interactions, they try to study models behavior in macro-level. These approaches, traditionally called compartment models used mainly to analyze biological contagions [2]. Compartments describe a set of states, namely, Susceptible (S), Infected (I), and Recovered (R). There are also parameters that represent transition rates for changing the states. The dynamical process, *e.g.* SI, SIS, SIR, is described by a differential equation which is used to model the number of population in each states [18]. The weakness of these method is the simplistic assumption of homogenous population without any network structure. The strength is some analysis like the epidemic threshold that can be used to predict the prevalence attained by the epidemic [2]. To resolve the weakness of these models, some techniques like heterogeneous mean-field [19] and particle-network framework is proposed. They extend the previous approaches using block-degree formalism, which assume all nodes with the same degree k are statistically equivalent [1].

Discrete and structured. There is another line of work stems from sociologist theories about social relations and influence spread, where the network structure is essential. To model the spread of idea in a social network, represented by a graph, typical assumptions are, having two state, and being progressive. That is, each nodes can be active or inactive and once a node adopt a behavior, becomes active, it can't switch to inactive state. Among the first to propose models that capture such a process were Granovetter and Schelling [20]. Linear Threshold and Independent Cascade model, are the two simplest and widely studies models of social contagion [21]. In linear threshold model, a node is influenced by their neighbors according to the weights in adjacency graph and a prespecified threshold. It becomes active when the weighted sum of its active neighbors be higher than the threshold. In independent cascade model, each infected node has independent probability to infects its neighbors. Beside the importance of these models in studies like influence maximization, they are discrete time and suffer from mentioned limiting assumptions.

Continuous and structured. Rodriguez, *et al.* try to investigate the underlying structure and temporal dynamics of information diffusion over networks [22]. In NetInf, the network structure is inferred from diffusion data using near-optimal submodular optimization [23]. This model is discrete time but, afterward Rodriguez et al. propose a model for information propagation and hidden network inference using survival theory [24, 25], called NetRate. It models the spread of a contagion (meme, behavior, information) across a fix network [26, 27]. InfoPath was the extension of this model to support dynamic networks that change over time. The problem of network inference from a set of cascades is theoretically investigated in [28]. In the case of infinite samples, the consistency and recovery conditions is derived. Moreover the sample complexity problem is considered by lower bounding the number of cascades required to recover network structure. One of the primary goals of continuous time models is the latent network inference, which start by works of [22]. In [29], the superposition property of poisson process is used to model the effect of users share activities on others in the communities, and consequently learning latent network. [16] also used the superposition property, and proposed a fully Bayesian model with parallel inference for this problem. The influence maximization in continuous model, has recently attract the attention of researchers. In [30], scalable influence estimation is addressed

by proposing a randomized nearly linear algorithm, called ConTinEst. The problem of activity shaping, driving population toward specific target state, by modeling events using multivariate Hawks process, is investigated for the first time in [17]. The most related work to ours is [3]. It investigated the adoption of products. The intensity of a user is affected by the weighted sum of its neighbors event history, and the weights models the competition or cooperation between different products. Although this model is continuous time but it can't infer latent diffusion network. It is also quadratic in the number of products, and it prone to overfitting when there are a few products.

3. PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, first we review the mathematical background, in short, and then present our method for modeling multiple correlated cascades.

3.1 Hawkes Process

Consider a continuous time point process, describing event times of a phenomena. According to the Kolmogorov extension theorem [25], finite dimensional distributions define a stochastic process. To describe finite dimensional distributions $f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)$, the joint probability of event occurrence in any sequence of times, we use the chain rule of probability: $f(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) = \prod_i f(t_i|t_{i-1:1})$. Therefore, it suffice to describe only the conditionals, which are abbreviated to $f(t_n|\mathcal{H}_n)$ or simply $f^*(t)$. A closely related notion is conditional intensity or hazard rate $\lambda^*(t)$ defined as

$$\lambda^*(t) = \frac{f^*(t)}{1 - F^*(t)} \tag{1}$$

where $F(.)$ is cdf of $f(.)$. The relation of $\lambda^*(t)$ and $f^*(t)$ can be expressed in the other direction as in [24]

$$f^*(t) = \lambda^*(t) \exp\left(-\int_{t_n}^{t} \lambda^*(s)ds\right) \tag{2}$$

Another basic concept in survival analysis is survival function, $S^*(t) = 1 - F^*(t)$, the probability that no event occurs after the last event in t_n till t, where

$$F^*(t) = 1 - \exp\left(-\int_{t_n}^{t} \lambda^*(s)ds\right) \tag{3}$$

To understand the hazard rate more intuitively we incorporate the alternative way of describing a point process, the counting process N associated to $\lambda^*(t)$. Let $N(t, s]$ denotes the number of events in interval $(t, s]$. Multiplying both sides of (1) by dt results in:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^*(t)dt &= \frac{\Pr\{N(t_n, t] = 0, N(t, t + dt] = 1|\mathcal{H}_n\}}{\Pr\{N(t_n, t) = 0|\mathcal{H}_n\}} \\
&= \Pr\{N(t, t + dt] = 1|\mathcal{H}_n, N(t_n, t] = 0\} \\
&= \Pr\{N(dt) = 1|\mathcal{H}_{t^-}\} \qquad (4) \\
&\approx \mathbb{E}[N(dt)|\mathcal{H}_{t^-}] \qquad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

where $N(dt) := N(t, t+dt]$. A variety of point processes can be constructed by specifying $f^*(t)$ or equivalently $\lambda^*(t)$. In the simplest case, the intervene time (time intervals between subsequent events) are assumed to be *i.i.d.*, so $\lambda^*(t) = \lambda(t)$. A special case is homogenous poisson process with constant intensity $\lambda^*(t) = \lambda$. In linear Hawkes process the *i.i.d* assumption is removed and conditionals are fully dependent on the history,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^*(t) &= \mu + \alpha \sum_{t_i \in \mathcal{H}_t} h(t - t_i) \qquad (6) \\
&= \mu + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^{t} h(t - s)N(ds) \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

where μ is the base intensity and α controls the effect of historical events on the future intensity. In the sequel, the star superscript of intensity is omitted for notational convenience. The kernel $h(t)$ is usually exponentially decaying so that the near past history has more effect on the intensity. This self-exciting property of Haweks process make it a common modeling tools in application like seismology, neurophysiology, epidemiology, reliability, and social network analysis [25, 8, 3, 27, 31, 26]

3.2 Correlated Cascades Model

Given a directed network $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, with $|\mathcal{V}| = N$ nodes and M behaviors which nodes of the network can adopt at most one of them in any time. Observing the times t_i, and the types of behavior adopted by users u_i of network $\mathcal{G}$ in time interval $[0, T]$, we try to model *users' behavior adoption* in the network. Denoting the observed data by $\mathcal{D} = \{(t_i, u_i, p_i)\}_{i=1}^{K}$, we can define the observations related to user v and product q up to time s, as $\mathcal{D}_v^q(s) = \{(t_i, u_i, p_i) \in \mathcal{D}|t_i < s, u_i = v, p_i = q\}$, and define $\mathcal{D}_v(s)$, $\mathcal{D}^q(s)$ and $\mathcal{D}(s)$ in a similar vein.

Now the question is, *how users in a network decide to adopt a behavior?* This is an important question in sociology which has been investigated for decades [32]. As observed by McAdam and Paulsen [33], "The fact that we are embedded in many relationships means that any major decision we are contemplating will likely be mediated by a significant subset of those relationships". In other words, the users behavior seems to be influenced by their neighbors, the *endogenous* effect. On the other hand each user has an internal inclination toward different choices, the *exogenous* effect [17]. These sociological mechanisms motivate us to use Hawkes process to model users behavior adoption. Hawkes process is a special case of Cox processes, the processes that can be transformed to Poisson process by conditioning [34]. The self-exciting property of Hawkes process pleasantly model the social reinforcement. Also a time decaying kernel in Hawkes process imitate the diminishing nature of endogenous excitations as opposed to the exogenous part which is modeled by the base rate. We implicitly assume the behaviors have the same type, otherwise we can use the existing independent cascade models [27]. Therefore we model the intensity of user u to adopt any behavior by,

$$\lambda_u(t) = \mu_u + \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}(t)|} \alpha_{u_i u}\, e^{-(t-t_i)} \tag{8}$$

where the summation is over the elements of the set $\mathcal{D}(t)$ and $|S|$ is the number of elements of set S, μ_u is the base intensity of user u or the exogenous effect, and α_{ji} is the influence of user j on i. In fact, the user intensity is the aggregation of different behavior excitations. The intensity of adopting behavior p by user u is defined as:

$$g_u^p(t) = \mu_u^p + \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}^p(t)|} \alpha_{u_i u}\, e^{-(t-t_i)}. \tag{9}$$

Hence the user intensity can be written equivalently as $\lambda_u(t) = \sum_p g_u^p(t)$, where $\mu_u = \sum_p \mu_u^p$. The user intensity, $\lambda_u(t)$, defines a point process that models the user behavior adoption, but the type of adopted behavior is not defined yet. The behavior type can be seen as marks of the Hawkes process. In [13], Hawkes generalized his model to multivariate and marked point processes. As a consequence the user-behavior intensity can be modeled by the following mutually exciting marked Hawkes process:

$$\lambda_u(t,p) = \lambda_u(t) f_u(p|t) \tag{10}$$

where $f_u(p|t)$ is the mark probability, *i.e.*, the probability that user u adopts behavior p at time t given history $\mathcal{D}(t)$. Intuitively when a user decides to select a behavior she takes the maximum among the excitation influence of different behaviors, $\arg\max_p g_u^p(t)$. The probabilistic version of the max function is the *soft-max* function. Inspired by *soft-max* we propose the following mark function:

$$f_u(p|t) = \frac{\exp(\beta g_u^p(t))}{\sum_q \exp(\beta g_u^q(t))} \tag{11}$$

where β controls the randomness of max function, from uniform for $\beta = 0$ to deterministic for $\beta = \infty$. The interpretation of the proposed model is that, users in the network are excited to adopt any behavior by their friends history of all adoptions, then to decide the behavior type, probabilistically select the behavior with maximum excitation.

In the case of linear mark function

$$f_u(p|t) = \frac{g_u^p(t)}{\sum_q g_u^q(t)} \tag{12}$$

the user behavior intensity simplifies to

$$\lambda_u(t,p) = g_u^p(t) \tag{13}$$

which is equivalent to independent cascade model [26], *i.e.* the log-likelihood can be written as sum of behaviors likelihood. The following proposition, is used to evaluated the likelihood of the proposed model.

Proposition 1. *Let N_u, $u = 1, 2, \cdots, N$ be a multivariate marked point process on $[0, T]$ with associated intensity $\lambda_u(t)$, and mark probability $f_u(p|t)$. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(t_i, u_i, p_i)\}_{i=1}^K$ be a time, user and mark realization of the process over $[0, T]$. Then the likelihood of $\mathcal{D}$ on model N_u with parameters θ can be expressed in the form*

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta|\mathcal{D}) = \left[\prod_{i=1}^K \lambda_{u_i}(t_i) f_{u_i}(p_i|t_i)\right] \exp\left(-\int_0^T \sum_{u=1}^N \lambda_u(s) ds\right) \tag{14}$$

Proof. Using chain rule we can write the probability of observation as

$$f(\mathcal{D}|\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^K f\left((t_i, u_i, p_i)|\mathcal{D}(t_i)\right) \prod_{u=1}^N S(T, u)$$

where $t_0 = 0$ and $S(T, u)$ is the probability that process $\lambda_u(t)$, survive after her last event,

$$S(T,u) = \exp\left(-\int_{t_{|\mathcal{D}_u|}}^T \lambda_u(s) ds\right)$$

by decomposing the fist product we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\mathcal{D}|\theta) &= \prod_{u=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} f\left((t_i, u_i, p_i)|\mathcal{D}(t_i)\right) \prod_{u=1}^N S(T,u) \\
&= \prod_{u=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} \lambda_u(t_i) \exp\left(-\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \lambda_u(s) ds\right) f_u(p_i|t_i) \prod_{u=1}^N S(T,u) \\
&= \prod_{u=1}^N \exp\left(-\int_0^{t_{|\mathcal{D}_u|}} \lambda_u(s) ds\right) \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} f_u(p_i|t_i) \lambda_u(t_i) \prod_{u=1}^N S(T,u) \\
&= \prod_{u=1}^N \exp\left(-\int_0^{t_{|\mathcal{D}_u|}} \lambda_u(s) ds\right) S(T,u) \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} f_u(p_i|t_i) \lambda_u(t_i) \\
&= \prod_{u=1}^N \exp\left(-\int_0^{T} \lambda_u(s) ds\right) \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} f_u(p_i|t_i) \lambda_u(t_i) \\
&= \prod_{u=1}^N \exp\left(-\int_0^{T} \lambda_u(s) ds\right) \prod_{u=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} f_u(p_i|t_i) \lambda_u(t_i) \\
&= \exp\left(-\int_0^T \sum_{u=1}^N \lambda_u(s) ds\right) \prod_{i=1}^K \lambda_{u_i}(t_i) f_{u_i}(p_i|t_i)
\end{aligned}$$

□

According to this proposition and relations (8)-(11), the log-likelihood of model can be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathcal{L}(\theta|\mathcal{D}) = &\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \log \lambda_{u_i}(t_i) - \sum_{u=1}^N \int_0^T \lambda_u(s) ds \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \beta g_{u_i}^{p_i}(t_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \log\left(\sum_{q=1}^M \exp\left(\beta g_{u_i}^q(t_i)\right)\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where parameters of the model are $\boldsymbol{A} = [\alpha_{ij}]$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = [\mu_i^p]$, $i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, N, p = 1, 2, \cdots, M$. We can decompose the summation over $t_i \in \mathcal{D}$ into the summation over u and $t_i \in \mathcal{D}_u$, which shows that the log-likelihood can be decomposed to sum of users log-likelihood,

$$\log \mathcal{L}(\theta|\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{u=1}^N \log \mathcal{L}(\theta_u|\mathcal{D}_u) \tag{16}$$

where user parameters θ_u, are $\boldsymbol{A}_u = [\alpha_{u\cdot}]$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_u = [\mu_{u}^{\cdot}]$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathcal{L}(\theta_u|\mathcal{D}_u) = &\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} \log \lambda_u(t_i) - \int_0^T \lambda_u(s) ds \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} \beta g_u^{p_i}(t_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_u|} \log\left(\sum_{q=1}^M \exp\left(\beta g_u^q(t_i)\right)\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Lemma 1. *Function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathrm{dom} f = \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex.*

$$f(x) = \log \sum_i \exp(a_i^T x + b_i)$$

Proof. According to [35], let $A = [a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n]^T$, $b = [b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_n]^T$ and $z_i = \exp(a_i^T x + b_i)$, and using chain rule we have

$$\nabla^2 f(x) = A^T \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{1}^T z} \mathrm{diag}(z) - \frac{1}{(\mathbf{1}^T z)^2} z z^T\right) A$$



Figure 3: Evaluation of the proposed model on synthetic data

Now we must show that for all u we have $u^T \nabla^2 f(x) u \geq 0$, or equivalently for all v, where $v = Au$ we have

$$v^T \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{1}^T z} \mathrm{diag}(z) - \frac{1}{(\mathbf{1}^T z)^2} z z^T \right) v \geq 0$$
$$\frac{\sum_i v_i^2 z_i}{\sum_i z_i} - \left(\frac{\sum_i v_i z_i}{\sum_i z_i} \right)^2 \geq 0$$
$$\left(\sum_i v_i^2 z_i \right) \left(\sum_i z_i \right) \geq \left(\sum_i v_i z_i \right)^2$$

which is true according to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. □

Proposition 2. *The negative of the user log-likelihood function, $-\log \mathcal{L}(\theta_u | \mathcal{D}_u)$ is convex.*

Proof. The first term is negative log of linear function which is convex, according to composition rules. The second and third term are linear, and the fourth term is convex according to lemma 1. □

Now to find the model parameters we can apply the maximum likelihood estimation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & -\log \mathcal{L}(\theta_u | \mathcal{D}_u) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \theta \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

on each user, which has unique solution according to proposition 2 and can be solved in parallel.

4. EXPERIMENTS

In this section we evaluate our method on both synthetic and real data.

4.1 Synthetic Data

We first explain how synthetic dataset is generated, then evaluation criteria that used for comparisons are introduced. The setting for the training of the proposed algorithm is also clarified. Finally the performance of the algorithm and the special experiment that is designed to show the prosperity of the correlated model with respect to its independent version, is investigated

4.1.1 Dataset Preperation

The underlying network is generated randomly according to Erdos-Renyi model [2]. We set the number of nodes and products (behaviors) to $N = 50$ and $M = 5$, respectively. We have generated 20,000 train events and 2000 test events, using Ogata's thinning method [36]. The parameters of the models are drawn randomly from uniform distribution, $\mu_{i,p} \sim U(0, 0.1)$ and $\alpha_{i,j} \sim U(0, 0.01)$, and we set $\beta = 1$. The convex optimization in equation (18) is solved using Barrier Method which transforms the constrained convex optimization to unconstrained one. It has two main loop, which solves an unconstrained optimization in inner loop and updated the barrier function in outer loop [35]. All implementations and our dataset are available in `http://ssp.dml.ir`.

4.1.2 Evaluation criteria

We evaluate the accuracy of learning the model parameters using the following metrics:

- `MSE`, mean squared error is defined as the average squared error between the estimated and true parameters, *i.e.* $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\theta_i - \hat{\theta}_i\|_2^2$.
- `MAE`, mean absolute error is the averaged relative error between the estimated and true parameters, *i.e.* $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|\theta_i - \hat{\theta}_i|}{\theta_i}$.
- `AvgPredLogLik`, average predicted log-likelihood is the negative log-likelihood over unseen test events, divided by the number of test events.

4.1.3 Parameter Learning

We train 10 models, on 10% to 100% of the synthetic training data. In Figure 3, we have evaluated the trained models using `MSE`, `MAE` and `AvgPredLogLik` performance measures. To be able to compare the size of train data with real dataset, we have plotted measures vs the average number of event per users. As expected, with the increase of training events the accuracy of recovering the underlying parameters improve.

4.1.4 Correlated Cascades

We design another experiment to compare the correlated nature of the cascade model with independent cascade model. To this end, first we create the independent version of our model by using the linear mark, equation (12), instead of exponential mark of relation (11), as mentioned in Section 3. Also randomly generate 4 similar models with the same $\mu_{i,p}$ and $\alpha_{i,j}$, where $\alpha_{i,j}$ is generated randomly in interval $[0, 0.1]$, and $\mu_{i,p}$ for all users were generated with small noise around 0.2, 0.5 and 0.3 for product $p = 1$,2 and 3 respectively. The number of nodes and products are also set to $N = 50$, and $M = 3$, respectively. In three correlated models, we set $\beta = 0.1, 1, 10, 100$ to see the effect of mark function parameter, on the competitive or cooperative behavior of the proposed model.

To show the success of our method in generation of correlated cascades, we design a simple incentivization scenario.



Figure 4: Intensity, market share and events number for independent and correlated with $\beta = 0.1$, $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = 100$, from left to right. Top row is intensity, middle row is market share and bottom row is number of event $N(0,t]$ for each products. In correlated model, after incentivization in time 100, the product usage of the other products change, whereas in independent models this change didn't take any effect on other products.

For all models, the history of events before time 100, is generated with the independent model. Afterward, the parameters μ_u^p of product $p = 3$ for all users is doubled, which can be regarded simply as an incentivization of users by the second service provider. Then each models generate its events separately till the end.

In Figure 4 overall intensity of all users in usage of three products, $\lambda^p(t)$, the cumulative marker share of each products, $N^p(0,t]/\sum_q N^q(0,t]$, and the overall number of events for each, $N^p(0,t]$ is illustrated. From the intensity digram, we can see that, after the incentivization, the intensity of users in correlated model with $\beta = 0.1$, becomes approximately the same, whereas in highly competitive model with $\beta = 100$ the second product is dominated shortly after incentivization which can be seen also from market share and number of events diagrams of Figure 4.

To better understand the difference of independent and correlated model, see the intensity of independent model, row and column one of Figure 4, in independent model, by incentivizing product $p = 2$, its intensity increase but the other two product didn't influenced by this change. On the other the adoption of incentivized product is also increase, but the intensity diagram clearly shows that the other two product didn't influenced by this change in product. On the contrary in correlated models this change affect on the usage of all other products, which validates the correlated feature of our model.

4.2 Real Data

In this subsection we introduce our real data sets which used for the evaluations of proposed method and comparisons with others. Then we explain the evaluation criteria and the parameters of the learning algorithms. Finally the results and comparisons is bring forward.

4.2.1 Datasets Preparation

We use the data gathered by Lerman from Twitter, which is available in `http://www.isi.edu/~lerman`. To create this dataset, Twitter's API is used to collect tweets over three weeks in Fall of 2010. The tweets containing a URL in the message body are retained. Then, they use Twitter's search API to retrieve all tweets containing those URLs, ensuring the complete tweeting history of all URLs, resulting in 3 million tweets in total [21]. The pruned dataset has about 2 K distinct URL's retweeted 213 K times. We post-process this dataset by first finding the 6 most popular ULR's shortening services, which are `bit.ly`, `migre.me`, `tinyurl.com`, `tiny.ly`, `j.mp`, and `is.gd`. Then select a collection of tweets of about 1000 users with at least 100 tweets containing URL of the mentioned URL shortening services. Through the paper, we



Figure 5: Average negative log likelihoods on test dataset, for different size of training set, in (*left*) Twitter URL dataset and (*right*) Twitter music dataset. `CP` is overfitted but, the other two methods trained successfully and also the generalization power of the proposed method is more than independent model.

refer to this dataset by "Twitter URL dataset".

We have also gathered our own dataset from Twitter. To select a set of active users, we query the Twitter search API, during one week in 2015, with some keyword about recent top musics and singers. We select 30,000 users, that were actively tweets about musics and a new albums. Then all tweets of this users were crawled using Twitter API, during one month of 2015. To use this dataset for the modeling of streaming music service adoption of users, we post-process raw data. First, the tweets containing the URLs of two well-know media streaming services, Google Play Music and YouTube are retained. Then, we only selected the tweets of active users with more than 50 tweets. Through the paper, we refer to this dataset by "Twitter music dataset".

The intensity (number of tweets per hour) of Twitter URL and music datasets, are plotted in the Figure 1. As mentioned in the introduction section, the positive and negative correlation between different cascades is apparent in the intensity diagrams.

4.2.2 Evaluation criteria

We evaluate our model in comparison with two other multiple cascade methods. The names are abbreviated by `CC`, `IC`, and `CP`, respectively for `C`orrelated `C`ascade, `I`ndependent `C`ascade and `C`ompeting `P`roducts adoption [3] models. In contrast to synthetic data there is no ground-truth available for real datasets. Hence we use only the likelihood measure, `AvgPredLogLik`, for the evaluations. the following measures for comparison of the performance of different algorithms:

4.2.3 Parameter Learning

We set aside the last 20% of the available data for the test set. The models are trained five times with 20% to 100% of the train data. The parameters of the optimization algorithm were fixed in all experiments. The results of the test likelihood for different model were plot versus training set size in Figure 5. Proposed method has the highest likelihood in both datasets, and is increasing with respect to the size of training set. The bad performance of `CP`, possibly cause by the overfitting on training data. Because the number of parameters `CP` is proportional to the squared of the number of products. Twitter URL dataset has 6 product and music has 2. Therefore, the overfit in music dataset should be more severe than URL, which can be seen from Figure 5.

The slight decrease in the performance of the proposed method in music dataset is due to mixed character of this dataset. As illustrated in Figure 1, there is a diverse range of correlation between cascades. For example, some product like `tiny.ly` and `tinyurl` are cooperating and some like `migre.me` and `j.mp` competing with each other. But even in this case it has better performance regard to `IC`.

4.2.4 Test Events Correlation

To further investigate the proposed method, we also design some other experiments, on the generated test events. Using the parameters of the model learned on the whole training data, we generate test events for each model. The model that has higher correlation with real test event, is more successful to predict future events, and is better in modeling of the observed cascades event history. We examined this feature, qualitatively and quantitatively in diagrams of Figures 6 and 7. We show only the intensity on one exemplar product for each dataset in Figure 6. Qualitatively it can be seen that proposed method is better followed the real test intensity curve, compared to the other methods. Most of the time it is closer to the real curve than `IC` and `CP`, only in a few intervals like the times near 9, and 5 hours in left Figure 6, that real test intensity has large oscillations, it was unsuccessful to simulate the real curve. Similar to the poor performance of `CP` in likelihood on test data, Figure 5, this model has generated more events, which results to its large distance with real curve.

Measuring the distance between two curve is a challenging problem at itself. We used two simple measures, inverse of ℓ_1 distance, and well-know Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. High inverse ℓ_1 distance and Pearson correlation, indicated high correlation between two curves. In Figure 7 the performance of different method on the Twitter dataset is demonstrated. The result are plotted for two cases; separate products, and all products in overall. In total we have higher correlation to the real test events. But like before, the performance of the proposed method in music dataset is slightly better than URL, which is explained already.

Finally in Figure 8, the number of test event for the mentioned exemplar product of Figure 6 is depicted. We used the semi-logarithmic scale in y-axis to better compare different methods. In two cases `CC` model results is the closest to the real test data.

5. CONCLUSIONS

We propose a method to model multiple correlated cascades. Multiple cascades spread over the network by the decision of users to adopt behavior of a particular cascade's

or not. Therefore we cast the network diffusion problem in to the behavior modeling of users in adoption to different products. To this end, the marked version of multivariate Hawkes process is utilized for modeling intensity of users' product adoption. The decision making procedure of users is also modeled by mark probability of the Hawkes process, where the competing or cooperating nature of the spreading behavior is controlled by the parameter of mark probability function.

In evaluation on synthetic dataset, we analyze how effectively the proposed method can recover the underlying network parameters. Furthermore, we design an experiment to show that the parameter of mark probability function defines the positive or negative correlation between cascades. The experimental results on both two real datasets gathered from tweets of Twitter, show that the proposed method, compared to others, is more successful to model the correlated cascades.

The slightly better performance of our method on music dataset with only two cooperating product, with respect to URL dataset with 6 products that have mixed competing and cooperating behavior, pinpoint a weakness of the model. One line of future work would refine the model to better cope with multiple mixed cascades. Another work is to saturate users intensity when overexposed by some behaviors. And finally, learning the parameter β of mark function is a daunting problem, which can be utilized to infer the correlation type of cascades from their event histories.

6. REFERENCES

[1] A. Vespignani, "Modelling dynamical processes in complex socio-technical systems," *Nature Physics*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 32–39, 2012.

[2] A. L. Barabasi, *Network Science*. Cambridge university press, 2015.

[3] I. Valera, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, and K. Gummadi, "Modeling diffusion of competing products and conventions in social media," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.0516*, 2014.

[4] J. Cheng, L. Adamic, P. A. Dow, J. M. Kleinberg, and J. Leskovec, "Can cascades be predicted?" in *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on World wide web*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2014, pp. 925–936.

[5] L. Tran, M. Farajtabar, L. Song, and H. Zha, "Netcodec: Community detection from individual activities," in *SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*. SIAM, 2015.

[6] N. Du, M. Farajtabar, A. Ahmed, A. Smola, and L. Song, "Dirichlet-hawke processes with applications to clustering continuous-time document streams," in *Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)*, 2015.

[7] M. Farajtabar, Y. Wang, M. G. Rodriguez, S. Li, H. Zha, and L. Song, "Coevolve: A joint point process model for information diffusion and network co-evolution," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.02293*, 2015.

[8] M. Farajtabar, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, N. Du, M. Zamani, H. Zha, and L. Song, "Back to the past: Source identification in diffusion networks from partially observed cascades," *arXiv:1501.06582*, 2015.

[9] X. He, G. Song, W. Chen, and Q. Jiang, "Influence blocking maximization in social networks under the competitive linear threshold model," in *SDM*. SIAM, 2012, pp. 463–474.

[10] N. Pathak, A. Banerjee, and J. Srivastava, "A generalized linear threshold model for multiple cascades," in *International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM'10)*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 965–970.

[11] W. Lu, W. Chen, and L. V. Lakshmanan, "From competition to complementarity: Comparative influence diffusion and maximization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.00317*, 2015.

[12] S. A. Myers and J. Leskovec, "Clash of the contagions: Cooperation and competition in information diffusion," in *Data Mining (ICDM), 2012 IEEE 12th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 539–548.

[13] A. G. Hawkes, "Spectra of some self-exciting and mutually exciting point processes," *Biometrika*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 83–90, 1971.

[14] K. Zhou, H. Zha, and L. Song, "Learning social infectivity in sparse low-rank networks using multi-dimensional hawkes processes," in *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTAT'13)*, 2013, pp. 641–649.

[15] C. Blundell, J. Beck, and K. A. Heller, "Modelling reciprocating relationships with hawkes processes," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2012, pp. 2600–2608.

[16] S. W. Linderman and R. P. Adams, "Discovering latent network structure in point process data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.0914*, 2014.

[17] M. Farajtabar, N. Du, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, I. Valera, H. Zha, and L. Song, "Shaping social activity by incentivizing users," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2014, pp. 2474–2482.

[18] M. A. Porter and J. P. Gleeson, "Dynamical systems on networks: A tutorial," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.7663*, 2014.

[19] Y. Moreno, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani, "Epidemic outbreaks in complex heterogeneous networks," *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 521–529, 2002.

[20] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos, "Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network," in *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. ACM, 2003, pp. 137–146.

[21] N. O. Hodas and K. Lerman, "The simple rules of social contagion," *Scientific reports*, vol. 4, 2014.

[22] M. Gomez-Rodriguez, *Ph.D. Thesis*. Stanford University, 2013.

[23] M. Gomez Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, and A. Krause, "Inferring networks of diffusion and influence," in *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. ACM, 2010, pp. 1019–1028.

[24] O. Aalen, O. Borgan, and H. Gjessing, *Survival and event history analysis: a process point of view*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

[25] D. Daley and D. Vere-Jones, *An Introduction to the*

Theory of Point Processes - Vol. I. Springer Ser. Statist., Springer, New York, 2002.

[26] M. G. Rodriguez, D. Balduzzi, and B. Schölkopf, "Uncovering the temporal dynamics of diffusion networks," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'11)*, 2011, pp. 561–568.

[27] M. G. Rodriguez, J. Leskovec *et al.*, "Modeling information propagation with survival theory," in *Proceedings of The 30th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'13)*, 2013, pp. 666–674.

[28] H. Daneshmand, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, L. Song, and B. Schölkopf, "Estimating diffusion network structures: Recovery conditions, sample complexity & soft-thresholding algorithm," in *Proceedings of the 31th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'14)*, 2014, pp. 793–801.

[29] T. Iwata, A. Shah, and Z. Ghahramani, "Discovering latent influence in online social activities via shared cascade poisson processes," in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining.* ACM, 2013, pp. 266–274.

[30] N. Du, L. Song, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, and H. Zha, "Scalable influence estimation in continuous-time diffusion networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2013, pp. 3147–3155.

[31] M. G. Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, D. Balduzzi, and B. Schölkope, "Uncovering the structure and temporal dynamics of information propagation," *Network Science*, vol. 2, no. 01, pp. 26–65, 2014.

[32] M. S. Granovetter, "The strength of weak ties," *American journal of sociology*, pp. 1360–1380, 1973.

[33] D. McAdam and R. Paulsen, "Specifying the relationship between social ties and activism," *American journal of sociology*, pp. 640–667, 1993.

[34] J. F. C. Kingman, *Poisson processes.* Oxford university press, 1992.

[35] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization.* Cambridge university press, 2004.

[36] Y. Ogata, "On lewis' simulation method for point processes," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 23–31, 1981.



Figure 6: Intensity of generated test events by three methods, compared with real test events in two exemplar products of Twitter URL and music dataset.



Figure 7: Pearson correlation and inverse ℓ_1 distance for the correlation of simulated test events by the three methods on URL and music dataset. These measures evaluated for each products separately, and all products in overall.



Figure 8: Number of events for the two real exemplar products of Figure 6 .